

Social Science Information

<http://ssi.sagepub.com>

The two Frances: The history of a geographical idea

Roger Chartier

Social Science Information 1978; 17; 527

DOI: 10.1177/053901847801700403

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ssi.sagepub.com>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[Maison des Sciences de l'Homme](#)

Additional services and information for *Social Science Information* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://ssi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://ssi.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Roger Chartier

The two Frances: The history of a geographical idea

Once again, geographical considerations loom large in historical study. In traditional teaching, the space/time duality was closely linked, with hardly any distinction being made between the survey of places and events. On the triumph of the historical preoccupation with states and nations, conceived as abstract, administrative, and homogeneous entities, this duality became somewhat looser: it was first of all the seas, primarily the Mediterranean, and then the lands, great and small, that reawakened in historians a taste for open-air history, for understanding the countryside, and thence the significance of spatial groupings. Historical research has availed itself of these geo-historical advances, which in themselves are no longer new; and, with its awareness of work in the neighbouring fields of economics and geography, now sees the problems of the use and organization of geographical space as being among its central concerns. These new interests are clearly revealed in the professional vocabulary: demographic and nutritional basins, urban axes and networks, and cultural spheres, have become essential notions both for the framing of new questions and the forging of new conceptual tools. In urban history, economic geography, and the quantitative history of culture, there have been increasing efforts to reconstruct the various ways in which geographical disparities and contrasts come about. Such enquiries are, nevertheless, still in their early stages, and any theoretical model that might give us a clear picture of the disparities revealed by the evidence so far collected is still

This article is based on a paper presented at F. Braudel's seminar on the 20th and 27th January 1977, and owes to the help and scholarship of Catherine Duprat. It was translated by Paul Rowland.

*Social Science Information (SAGE, London and Beverly Hills),
17, 4/5 (1978), pp. 527-54*

tentative. This is doubtless the reason why people have looked to older geographical ideas for help; Botero, Le Maître, and von Thünen (to mention only three of the names resurrected by Perrot) have accordingly been examined for their interpretations of the interwoven relationships within a geographical community.

The following article should be read in this context: it is intended as a survey of past opinion on spatial divisions. The chosen ground is that which has preoccupied French historiography for at least twenty years, i.e. the radical opposition that seems to exist between the two Frances separated by an imaginary line running from Saint-Malo to Geneva. Reference to such a line has in fact become a convenient way of distinguishing the major contrasts that differentiate the two countries that meet here. Everything appears different on either side of this diagonal territorial divide: agricultural landscape and technology, density of communications and manufacturing, the height of men and their aptitude in the acquisition of writing skills. Persistently added to, this catalogue of French contrasts enables us to recognize the opposition between northern and southern France as a long-standing phenomenon, discernible as early as the end of the 17th century, and still frequently evident.¹ The collection and interrelating of new or refined indicators still have to be accomplished for our better understanding of this fundamental division of the country.²

Our concern here, however, is of another order. We shall be trying to give a conspectus of the various ways in which France was visualized in the past, and to understand how the differential geography of the country was conceived at various times. The assembled corpus, which no doubt contains lacunae, has been analysed with two objectives. First, there is the question of elucidating our national heritage: the issue of the two Frances is certainly not the invention of the recent past, or of historians. We must therefore establish its genealogy in order to grasp more clearly the ideological interests which favoured its emergence, and which it carried along in its wake. For, as the second point, the study of geographical concepts seems useful for our understanding of the links between the blossoming of the social sciences and the political and economic debates that pervaded the social elites from Louis XVth to Louis-Philippe. Seeing how and why it was that the concept

of a divided France became prevalent makes us better able to understand the goals and nature of progress itself: hence the option of a retrospective approach. This would first of all highlight the period of the *monarchie censitaire*, which saw the multiform victory of the idea of the two Frances. Our attention would then shift to the second half of the 18th century, where we would remark upon the various texts in which this consciousness of an established partition of the kingdom came to the fore: thus we might understand why the idea should then remain confined to within such narrow limits.

The history of the different Frances begins in 1822, buried among the pages of a work by the prolix Italian geographer Adrien Balbi. In volume II of his *Essai statistique sur le Royaume de Portugal et d'Algarve*, he devotes an exposition to institutions for public education under the French monarchy. In this he inserts, without comment, a table showing the number of pupils in royal and local colleges, the boarding schools and the primary schools for each educational district. The total number of students in each district, including those at university, is given in relation to the population in 1821.³ Twenty years before Villemain⁴ we have the publication of Balbi's new statistical material whose value was to be recognized, for example, by Guerry in 1832: "The first documents published on the state of public education are to be found in this work of the Venetian geographical scholar."⁵ Published indeed, but not exploited. In fact it was the Danish geographer Conrad Malte-Brun who, settling in France during the Empire, first used Balbi's figures in a discussion of the divisions within France, in his book review in the *Journal des Débats*⁶.

Such a step was made possible by the crystallization of the educational data into two broad homogeneous groupings. Relating the number of schoolboys at the various educational levels to that of the male population, Malte-Brun noted that: "If we divide France into two parts, one including the north and east, and the other including the south and west (excluding Paris, if so desired), we obtain two completely different results." In the first grouping, comprising twelve educational districts, there were a hundred and twenty-three schoolboys to every thousand men, while in the second, which was thirteen districts strong, the figure was only forty-nine. Hence the basic conclusion that: "Public education in the south and west of France thus compares to that in the north and east in the order of 1 to 2½." The article did not draw any clear frontier between these two Frances, so unequally educated, since Malte Brun using the

framework of the educational subdivisions (the *académies*) was led to place the districts of Orléans, Lyons, and Grenoble within the north and east groupings whereas they were equally oriented towards the south. But he did lay down the essential procedure, which was to relate provincial or regional inequalities back to a polarity. The established fact of the differences was not dissipated among myriad minute contrasts, but could be read as a clearly discernible pattern, open to reason.

As a footnote to this new basic division he introduced, Malte Brun touched upon several questions that were to provide food for further thought. First of all, he situated France on the European map: "We would never have imagined that several parts of southern and western France were on a level with the most educationally deprived countries of Europe, while in the same respect the north of France was on a footing with the most civilised lands in the world." The dividing line which cleaves Europe thus passes through the kingdom. This may henceforth be considered as a microcosm within which can be found, on a reduced scale, the same contrasts that are visible across the whole continent. Secondly, via a phrase on the subject of Austria, he returned to the link established by the *Lumières* between the progress of education and the fall in crime: "In quite recent administrative reports, we have had the satisfaction of seeing the crime rate diminish in proportion to the increase in the number of primary schools." This claim, which was later to become a bone of contention, was not taken as decisive by Malte-Brun. What was important for him was rather the relationship between education and the 'administration'. The effective exercise of power ultimately presupposes the homogeneity of the social body over which it rules, whereas the figures revealed that France was not at all uniform, and that immense cultural gaps separated its provinces. Politics had to take these variations into account; they were not random, but could be shown by careful analysis to have a coherent pattern.

The internal boundary of this divided France, identified by Malte-Brun, was first traced by Baron Charles Dupin in 1826. Having marked on a map the number of inhabitants necessary in each *département* to produce one primary school pupil, he thus addressed his audience at the *Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers*: "Observe, from Geneva all the way to Saint-Malo, a clear, dark line separating the north and south of France. To the north there are only thirty-two *départements* with a total of thirteen million inhabitants; to the south fifty-four *départements* with eighteen million inhabitants. The

thirteen million inhabitants of the North send 740,846 young people to school; the eighteen million inhabitants of the South send 375,931 pupils to school. It thus follows that for every million inhabitants the North of France sends 56,988 children to school, and the South 20,885. Primary education is therefore three times more widespread in the North than in the South.”⁷ The inventor of a line which, under Maggiolo’s name, was destined for an illustrious future, Dupin was also the author of the formula which saw the north as ‘enlightened France’,⁸ and, subsequently, the south as ‘benighted France’. This text, perhaps less original than was believed, prompts two complementary remarks. It immediately shifts the debate on popular education from the political to the economic sphere. For Malte-Brun, the value of primary education, taken as an ‘instrument of civilization’, in effect basically depended upon the authority of power: “To be able to read, march in line, and fire straight with a rifle are equally dangerous or useful talents in a monarchy or democracy, according to how well governments can direct popular opinion.” For Dupin, the development of popular education had a completely different significance, since it constituted the very condition for universal progress, economic and intellectual.

‘Enlightened France’ was actually the wealthier, as witnessed by land-tax and trading licences, and was the most fertile in talent, as demonstrated by patents, prizes awarded by Paris colleges, entrants to *Polytechnique*, and members of the *Académie des Sciences*. The figures which Dupin placed on either side of the decisive line agreed sufficiently well to show the benefits of popular education, posited as the decisive factor in explaining the unequal development of the kingdom.

Systematizing the contrasts between north and south, Dupin in the above-mentioned address, proposed what amounted to a new geographical interpretation: one that was to be somewhat forgotten in the *Forces productives et commerciales*. The south and west of France were not really a single entity at all: thirteen of its *départements*, in the Rhône, Languedoc, and Pyrenean areas constituted its “most industrious and affluent part”, because there popular education was “the least backward”.⁹ This statement implicitly designated Brittany, the Loire valley, and the centre of France as the least economically and culturally developed, advancing into the midst of the more enlightened parts of the country. This division, which contrasted an eastern France, stretching down from the Channel across to the Mediterranean, to an Atlantic France,

penetrating far into the interior, was to meet with less success than the one dividing north and south. Nevertheless, Stendhal was acquainted with it, even before Fox:¹⁰ "Any Minister of the Interior who wants to do his job properly, instead of intriguing around the king and in the Chambers, like Mr. Guizot, should request an appropriation of two million a year in order to bring the inhabitants of the fatal triangle stretching between Bordeaux, Bayonne, and Valence, up to the educational level of the rest of the country."¹¹ But the attention that Dupin was shortly to focus upon the economic inequalities was to obliterate this subtler geography in favour of the dualistic interpretation.

In his great work, published in 1827, Dupin devoted one book, the sixth, to a "Comparison of the north and south of France with the whole of France." In this, he approached the differentiation within the kingdom in terms of a developmental model.¹² Taking the statistics published by Chaptal in 1819, or those of the administrative authorities (for indirect taxation, of forests and mines), he distributed them between the two regional groupings established in the educational sphere, and incorporated them in the framework proposed in his address a year earlier. In doing this, Dupin brought up a new question: that of the overall organization of the national economic space. The imperial administrators, who used statistics furnished by the prefects,¹³ had a different geographical conception, composed of two pictures: one which took into account the infinite diversity of reality, and the other which clung to the idea of national unity. In Peuchet's works, the synthesis of prefectural statistics took the form of a series of juxtaposed departmental or regional descriptions; but the data collected were never aggregated so as to reveal large contrasts on the imperial scale.¹⁴ Chaptal's work, on the contrary, was dominated by a unitary vision. Even if his tables were presented by *département*, his favourite descriptive terms were 'everywhere' and 'nowhere', which attest to a monolithic conception of the area of France.¹⁵ Between the perception of differences dispersed at the local and departmental level and of the unity of the country, transferred from the political to the economic sphere, there is no room for an intermediary level of interpretation¹⁶; and it is here that we are better able to gauge the innovative contribution of the 'arithmeticians' of the Restoration.

Working on the basis of the value of agricultural and industrial products, per capita income, and public revenue, Dupin concluded upon the unquestionable superiority of northern France: the Saint-

Malo (or Cherbourg)-Geneva line did indeed divide two distinct economic universes. Reading between the lines of such a claim, we can see the outlines of an explanation that operates on three levels. In the first place, one can point to natural assets. Thus, at the beginning of Book Seven, which deals with internal traffic, we find a stress on northern France's provision with natural water resources, and therefore canals. But this cannot be the heart of the matter, since the south has other compensations, being endowed with a climate that permits types of agriculture not possible in the north.¹⁷ Other reasons must therefore be advanced for the inequalities of development: history must be taken into consideration to some extent. Taking the problem of peasant incomes, Dupin wrote: "Agricultural wages in the south of France are sufficient, at a pinch, for survival as long as the worker remains healthy and strong; but as soon as he becomes ill, infirm, or old, he is without resources and cannot survive with his family without recourse to the charity of individuals, to the poor-house, etc. *Throughout the kingdom, such was the deplorable condition of the peasants before the revolution*" (our emphasis).¹⁸ This reasoning is informed by an historical schema, which proceeds from the observation of a disparity to the actual differentiating process. It is as though history stopped at the Saint-Malo-Geneva line, and as though the absence of development in the south came to be seen as an inferior development in contrast with the progress of northern France. The key to such a progression was a cultural one: not only was primary education more widespread in northern France, but academic competition was keener there also. For every hundred pupils admitted to the royal colleges, there were 15,980 primary schoolchildren in the north, but only 6,931 in the south: "Those individuals picked out of the ordinary class to go on to the higher-level schools are therefore selected from among a far greater number of competitors in the north than in the south. This, in my opinion, is the reason for the superiority of the northern French in letters, the sciences, and the arts".¹⁹ And one might add, without doing any injustice to Dupin, in all those activities and ways of earning one's living that depend "upon the learning of the population rather than upon the fertility of the soil".

This academic forerunner of Darwinism constitutes Dupin's basic explanation of northern France's lead, which he proposed be imitated by his 'compatriots in the South'. This is the burden of the two volumes of the *Forces productives et commerciales*: to provide those who have been forgotten by, or who are oblivious to, progress, with

the description of a France that might serve as a guide. Thus the book opens with the solemn exhortation: "Compatriots of the South, it is to you that I dedicate this description of northern France. For your open-minded emulation, and thoughtful imitation, I present the model of a part of the kingdom."²⁰ Hence the survey, in the form of an imaginary trip round the thirty-two *départements* situated on the right side of the internal frontier. Their pre-eminence was revealed above all by their greater industrial strength, which determined the inequality of the conditions of exchange between the two Frances: "There is a considerable trade between the north and south of France. The south sends large quantities of wine, spirits, oils, livestock, wool, silks, and silkware, etc. In return it receives iron wrought into a thousand forms, the work of goldsmiths, jewellers, and cabinet makers, woollens of every description, spun and woven cottons, books, engravings, and many works of art. We can see that the south of France sends mainly agricultural products to the north, whereas the north, on the other hand, sends mainly manufactured products to the south. These products, such as woollens, are even in part produced from southern raw materials."²¹ Here, Dupin was outlining a possible analysis of French inequalities in terms of the geography of under-development, all of whose corollaries he was unable to deduce since he did not posit the structural imbalance of north-south trade as constituting, but simply as symptomatic of, the disparity. As far as he was concerned, the important thing was not the manner in which the north exploited the south, but the example set by the former, whose progress could be imputed to its proximity to neighbouring industrial nations. Northern France was "favoured above all by the proximity of highly advanced industrial nations with excellent institutions, such as the British, the Swiss, and the Batavians". Southern France, on the other hand, only had for neighbours "those nations of Spain and Portugal, Sardinia and Africa, which for so long have been backward and degraded through bad laws and bad governments".²² In Dupin the theme of the two Frances became the vehicle for a fervent plea, uniting the exaltation of industry with the celebration of parliamentary institutions. The model of development lay in the north, in England and Scotland, where a new and optimum balance had been found between the agricultural and industrial populations. By following this example northern France would progress still further, and the south would set history in motion again and make up lost time. Thanks to the shift of the surplus agricultural population into industry and the

spread of popular education, the Saint-Malo-Geneva line would disappear, and the whole of France, with no internal division, would savour the delights of English prosperity.

To the two pairs of opposing factors, enlightened France/benighted France and prosperous France/impooverished France, there was added another which shook the geography of values. The publication in 1827 of the first *Compte Général de l'Administration de la Justice Criminelle* introduced new statistical material and at the same time heightened the debate about the various 'influences' capable of explaining criminal acts.²³ The statistical information that it contained was rapidly popularized, as can be seen from its presence in a sheet published by Balbi in 1828 under the title *La Monarchie Française comparée aux principaux Etats du Monde*²⁴ It was used above all as the foundation of the 'moral statistics' which the Academy of Sciences was to place in 1833 "in the highest rank of the various branches of general statistics". It is in this context that we must view the research of the lawyer Guerry, who was the first to recognize a geography of criminality.²⁵ To aggregate the data for each *département* contained in the *Compte général*, Guerry made his own subdivisions, stating their impartiality: "We shall therefore divide France into five natural regions: the north, south, east, west, and centre, each one combining seventeen contiguous *départements*. This is not an arbitrary division, nor does it tend to favour any system, since it is totally geometrical and the boundary of each region is determined by that of the other four."²⁶ Guerry's procedure is interesting on two counts: for a start, his apologia is meant to reconcile nature and geometry, thus legitimizing an entirely theoretical subdivision of the area of France by a reference to a permanent datum, the occurrence of natural regions. Here we see again Dupin's concern to identify his two Frances with those which "our ancestors distinguished as the lands of the *langue d'oïl* and the *langue d'oc*",²⁷ and doubtless also the tensions attendant upon the division of the country into *départements* in 1790. Whether for tracing out area boundaries or marking out units on a map, such a way of redefining space is in need of supporting evidence drawn from nature or history. In addition, by partitioning France into five, Guerry was immediately breaking up the Saint-Malo -Geneva line, and with it its whole accompanying evaluative structure.

In fact, the geography of criminal acts drawn up according to the *Compte général* for the years 1825-1830 did not obey a single law, but varied according to the crime. In the case of crimes against

people we find the south at the top of the list, the east second, the north third, and the west and centre last. With crimes against property the order is different, with the west and centre still last and the east second, but the south and north occupying reversed positions, the latter being here the most crime-prone region. Such a distribution might give rise to optimism, since "the parts of the kingdom guilty of most crimes against the person record only very few against property";²⁸ but it did pose the essential question of the relationship between ignorance and crime. To support his argument, Guerry referred to new educational indicators. The figures for school-attendance, which formed the basis for Malte-Brun's and Dupin's reasoning, were not enough. We should rather look at the percentages of conscripts with reading and writing skills, available since 1827. The geography suggested by these was of a France divided into three: the north and east, where nearly three-quarters of the young were literate; the west and centre, where the maximum ignorance was to be encountered; and finally the south, which fell between the two. Reviving the ternary interpretation of the geography of France outlined by Dupin in 1826, Guerry used it to refute the long-assumed link between crime and ignorance: the educated north was the most felonious with regard to property, and the violent south was not the most ignorant. This showed, therefore, that: "The *départments* in which there is the greatest ignorance are not, as is stated every day, those in which most crimes against the person are committed. We need make no mention here of crimes against property, since these take place mainly in *départments* with the most education."²⁹

This demonstration by Guerry seems exemplary: not because he advances any new ideas, but because of the way he proceeds. Casting doubt upon the positive correlation between educational progress and the decline of criminality is not, in fact, peculiar to him. Among others, Benoiston de Chateauneuf put it thus in 1827: "If we observe the religious countries, we find them to be no less crime-prone than the others, while those ruled by ignorance often transgress less than those enlightened by learning. It has been long recognized that in Berry, Poitou, the Auvergne, and Savoy, lands unenlightened by the academies and the sciences, justice rarely had a criminal to punish; whereas thefts and murders were common among the Spanish, an extremely religious people, and equally so among the English, an extremely educated nation."³⁰ But this pronouncement on its own was not sufficient to stop the interminable merry-go-round of arguments that nothing could substantiate. This is why Guerry considered that

his claim required the support of a statistical and geographical analysis capable of giving it the force of fact. The detour via geographical reasoning, whence the subdivision of the country, was a necessary element in a device aimed at testing public opinion and popular beliefs. The face of France thus became the scene of an experimentation which led Guerry to two conclusions, the one explicit: i.e. that school is not sufficient to prevent the 'demoralization' of nations, and the other implicit, locating the morality of France in its most culturally backward area. Thus unobtrusively began the revival of the disinherited and illiterate France.

This was to be more glaring and polemical on another level: that of pauperism. With Bigot de Morogues³¹ or Villeneuve-Bargemon,³² the implications of the divided France became a political engine of war, turned against the theses of Baron Dupin. If they accepted the Saint-Malo-Geneva line, it was in order to subvert its significance. In Bigot de Morogues, it marked a frontier of happiness and morality, the advantage lying entirely with the fifty-four southern *départements*, in which the offenders judged in intermediate-level courts (*en correctionnelle*) were less numerous, crimes against property less frequent, and suicides rarer. As he so neatly put it: "Those who speculate and reckon along with our great industrialists of the north often throw themselves in the river; those who laugh and dance with our village girls of the south take good care not to fall in."³³ To this evidence, which extolled southern sociability, Villeneuve-Bargemon added another decisive claim, to do with the distribution of poverty. According to his information and calculations, one finds one pauper to every nine inhabitants in the north, but only one to every twenty-one inhabitants in the south; and if one looks carefully at the percentages of those invalidated out of the services either through infirmity or deformity, it becomes clear that: "The physical and sanitary condition of the working classes in the south is incomparably better than that of the same classes in the north."³⁴ Thus the two Frances exchanged positions on the scale of values, since industrial development implied the physical, material, and moral distress of the greatest number.

This lesson was valid for Europe as well as France. A surprising, gradated map of pauperism actually revealed the following rank order: one pauper to every six inhabitants in England, one to every seven in the Netherlands, one to every ten in Switzerland, one to every twenty in Germany, one to every twenty-five in Austria, Denmark, France, Italy, Portugal, and Sweden, one to every thirty in

Prussia, one to every forty in Turkey, and finally one to every hundred in Russia. There was a simple logic to this distribution: "The number of the poor is seen to grow everywhere by reason of the growth and congregation of the working population, the predominance of manufacturing industry over agricultural, the application of English doctrines of civilization and political economy, and the abandonment of the principles of religion and charity."³⁵ By thus placing hell in England and heaven in Russia, Villeneuve-Bargemon avowed his ideology. Christian, aristocratic, and agrarian; and he pointed out the enemy, which went under the various titles of Protestantism, philosophy, and industry. Ranked in the middle of the scale of European pauperism, France was traversed by the 'front' separating the two political economies; the English and the Christian. There, where the former already prevailed, i.e. in the north and east of the country, industry had already imposed its own train of miseries: "The industrial and agricultural system practised in that part of France ceaselessly tends on one hand to increase the manufacturing population, and on the other to lower wage-rates, to concentrate capital and the profits of industry, and to bring together all the poverty-creating elements."³⁶ This iron law had to be broken, by looking to the example set by southern France, with its balance of charity and agriculture, and by tirelessly attacking the opinions of those who, like Dupin, would like to force "the bitter fruits of modern materialistic civilization" upon the whole nation. The Saint-Malo-Geneva line had to be erased but only by repulsing the changes coming down from the north.

Although sometimes naïvely reactionary, Villeneuve-Bargemon's work is of interest to us for two reasons. On one hand, it bears witness to the way in which the issue of the two Frances was capable of being turned into ammunition for the political battle under the July Monarchy. The choice of statistical indicators, their interrelationship and the value attributed to one part or the other were not really unbiased by any standards, but were simply the expression of opposite schemes and programmes. References culled from history were complemented or replaced by the contradictory lessons of social events; and confrontations over past issues gave way to battles of numbers and maps. It was the impact of the distribution on the map of the newly acquired statistical data which gave a new face to politics: the ideological discussions having their origins in the Revolution were for a while set aside. In addition the *Economie politique chrétienne*, more than any other work, placed France

squarely on the European map. In Dupin, or later on in d'Angeville, the area of France remained closed in upon itself. There were doubtless administrative reasons for this, since the statistics used would have tallied badly with those available from outside the kingdom. But the essential factor lay perhaps elsewhere: it is really only by thinking in terms of a closed unit that variations can be discerned and located. The internal divisions of the kingdom implied a previous operation: that of detaching it from the whole of which it forms part. It took all the ideological Manicheism of a Villeneuve-Bargemon to place France within a cultural space which transcends it, and which explains so much about it.

Adolphe d'Angeville's better-known work, published in 1836,³⁷ forms a sequel to this first survey. From several viewpoints it may be regarded as a culmination, primarily on account of the unusually broad scope of the statistical material. Eight tables of figures in effect comprise ninety-seven different indicators, thirty-three concerning 'moral statistics', twenty-seven the data for physical and cultural anthropology, seventeen the economy, and sixteen demography. Such abundance allowed d'Angeville to increase the number of cross-tabulations and to attempt 'every manner of combination' so as to test previously established relationships between social phenomena, such as, for example, between education and criminality (p. 69), industry and pauperism (p. 80), industry and criminality (pp. 102-103), or to validate new ones, such as between the spirit of Catholicism and morality (p. 104), or education and nutrition (p. 116). The *Essai sur la statistique de la population française* was the result of fifteen years work and statistical argument. It introduced no innovation, either in methods of quantification or in its reliance upon correlations, but it did carry them to a level never attained by previous arithmeticians.

We do, on the other hand, find in his work a juxtaposition of the various scales according to which the area of France was perceived. The basic grid is provided by a "study of France by *départements*", in the form of a series of separate sections each identically presented, and classified in alphabetical order. This dispenses both with the pretence of a journey, as maintained by Dupin, and the regional groupings sometimes present in works of the Empire period. Among the multitude of indicators, sixteen are shown on maps to reveal the 'agglomerations' that permit the partition of France into several large groupings. Even more importantly, the maps and statistics show a major rift, reminiscent of Dupin and his division of the coun-

try: "The more one studies human statistics, the more one finds this division to be rational in terms of facts relating to the population. One might even be tempted to believe that two populations have just run into one another on the line linking the port of Saint-Malo with the city of Geneva."³⁸ D'Angeville makes only two slight corrections to Dupin's two Frances: he slips the Loiret into northern France and the Ain into the south; and in geographical language inherited from Buache he explains the basic division which places the 'basins' of the Rhine, the Seine, and the Saône on one side, and those of the Rhône, the Garonné, and the Loire on the other side. D'Angeville thus integrated different geographical approaches to the concrete reality of France, and in doing so he laid claim to, and systematized the heritage of his time.

It was when he came to pronounce judgement as to which was the better France that he found himself in a quandary. In his view, the parallel dividing north and south worked clearly to the advantage of neither of the two protagonists. The maps of the *départements* were sufficient to show the differences between the indicators: height and nutrition were better in the north, but the lifespan was longer in the south, and the constitution of the inhabitants more robust; in the north, education was more widespread but crime more common, there was greater wealth but less morality. The final diagnosis could only record the interplay of contradictions in a factual discourse which was no longer of polemical value.³⁹ With d'Angeville, geographical thinking lost its pedagogical and polemical force, insofar as it became less obsessed by the reference to a model, be it of English manufacturing or traditional agriculture. Although he was an agricultural innovator, this political conservative nevertheless pleaded the cause of industry: "Were France to adopt the industrial system, then those central regions at present so backward and sluggish would gain a certain prosperity; the country would become more homogeneous." All the same, he knew the price, and, after 1834, the risks of industrialization. As opposed to Dupin, he wanted to restrain the pace: "Let us hope that we will not confuse the orderly and desirable industrial development of our provinces and minor towns with the industrial centralization which concentrates vast numbers of the proletariat into a few cities, and vast amounts of capital into a few hands; this is one supposed English virtue that we certainly have no wish to emulate."⁴⁰ 'A theoretician of development' d'Angeville certainly was; but forewarned by the complex lesson of the two Frances, he thought of it in terms of dispersal.

Thus, within the fifteen years between 1822-1836 there emerged an issue that dominated, and formed the focal point of, a whole series of political and scientific debates. We could let the matter rest with d'Angeville, the last and outstanding example of the period preceding the *Statistique Générale de la France*. It is tempting, however, to go further upstream and review the geographical conceptions of France that were advanced in the 18th century. Our enquiry, incomplete of necessity, took us first to the political physiocrats and arithmeticians who, in a variety of ways, presented a holistic geographical conception of the kingdom. Among the first, the guiding principle was theoretical, based upon the distinction made by Quesnay in his two articles in the *Encyclopédie*. The first was formulated in the article on *Fermiers*: "The fields are generally cultivated by farmers with horses, or by share-croppers with oxen",⁴¹ and the second is defined in the article on *Grains*: "We have already examined the state of agriculture in France, and the two kinds of cultivation: large-scale cultivation, or that which uses the horse, and small-scale cultivation, based upon oxen."⁴² These two economic categories, abstract by definition, and the result of a theoretical framework in which technology and agricultural methods were related, became the favourite analytical tools of the physiocratic school. Witness the work of de Butré in which the opposition of large-scale to small-scale farming is made explicit: "In France there are two types of farming: the large-scale which is practised by the rich Farmers with horses, and the small-scale, which is practised by the Share-croppers who only use oxen. These two types of cultivation are very different in their use of the land, their costs, and their produce."⁴³

But for the physiocrats, these two categories, which were used as basic concepts of economic thought, could equally well be translated into geographical terms. Applied to the territory of the kingdom, they made it possible to locate the essential agricultural contrasts geographically. In Quesnay, as in de Butré, this amounted to tracing the boundaries of the area of large-scale farming, so as to show its pitifully small size, and to recommend its rational emulation. In the words of Quesnay: "Large-scale farming is presently confined to about six million *arpents* of land, mainly comprising the provinces of Normandy, Beauce, the Ile-de-France, Picardy, French Flanders, Hainaut and a few others."⁴⁴ De Butré revised the count, adding Artois and part of Champagne, but including only a part of Normandy.⁴⁵ Six million *arpents* out of the thirty effectively cultivated

left immense tracts to small-scale farming: "Almost all the inland provinces have lapsed into small-scale farming."⁴⁶ Thus the France of the physiocrats was also dualistic; but the inequalities between the two parts were even greater than they were to be in Dupin, so much so that this geographical division conjured up a past in which it had had a different aspect and a history of decline. To recognize the shrinking of the areas under large-scale cultivation is at the same time to admit the degraded state of agriculture in the country.

Within this primary theoretical and geographical division there were others permitting a more sophisticated analysis and distribution. For de Butré, in fact, there were three categories of large-scale farming, ordered according to the relationship between annual investment and net return: the affluent, in which investment yields 100% in terms of net return; the average, in which it yields no more than 66%; and finally the poor, in which only a modest return is possible. Here again, the theoretically defined economic categories can be mapped out territorially: the logic of their distribution being a function of their proximity to the city. Affluent large-scale farming, for example, "is hardly ever practised except in those provinces which are a short distance from the capital or some other major city. This favours sales, and ensures the market price necessary to repay the cost of cultivation."⁴⁷ The same division into three categories, and the same principle of distribution are also valid for small-scale farming. In this case, the categories are defined according to the amount of income from cultivable soil. Small-scale farming of the first category provides: "1st costs, 2nd taxes, and 3rd a very small income for the owners." In the second category: "The soil itself yields no income, the harvest hardly covering costs and taxes; what income there is comes from pasturage, and amounts to rather less than the interest on the capital cost of the livestock." Finally, in small-scale farming of the third category: "The soil does not even repay costs and taxes, the major part of which has to be taken out of the income from pasturage."⁴⁸ These three categories spread out around the towns in a series of concentric circles. The first category "is to be found only around the provincial capitals and major cities in areas of small-scale farming"; the second appears "beyond the outskirts of provincial capitals and major cities in the areas of small-scale farming, far away from the banks of any river" while the third is confined "to the provincial backwoods which are far from the capital".⁴⁹

This work thus provides the fundamentals of a 'spatial' economy. To some extent it foreshadows that of von Thünen,⁵⁰ while at the

same time laying down a simple principle for mapping out an area: a principle owing nothing either to history or the picturesque. We may note with some interest the statement that it is the cities, and in particular the provincial capitals, which act as polarizing forces upon geographical distribution. The basic division between large and small-scale farming is itself dependent upon the location of the capital, the pre-eminent city. The power of the urban presence is such that it pushes natural factors into second place, and itself shapes the inland landscape: "Compared to the provinces under large-scale farming, those outside the orbit of the capital put one in mind of some other world, of another climate in a new world."⁵¹ Although subsequently overlooked in divisions that tended to ignore them, here the cities are accorded their full significance as focal points of the interlocking and intersecting regions that comprised the kingdom. The physiocratic interpretation was to leave its mark, even when stripped of all the complexities with which de Butré had invested it. We may note that the only overall division of France alluded to by Chaptal, who thought in monolithic terms, was precisely the one taken from Quesnay.⁵²

Matters are less clear when we turn to the 18th century demographers, since the principles of geographical analysis varied from one to another, depending upon which factor each posited as the determinant in the study of population. For Moheau, the key to demographic behaviour, expressed in terms of densities, was to be found in the various types of economic activity. For this reason he proposed a scale of agricultural occupations, arranged according to the extent to which they stimulated population growth. At the top were the coastal areas: "Because here the population finds an easily obtainable food in the form of fish, and a firm guarantee of employment in the commercial demand for labour." Next came the wine-growing areas; then, 'far behind', the areas of wheat, followed by those of pasturage and finally those of forest and heathland.⁵³ But, in view of the overlapping of products, this theoretical scale of densities loses its usefulness: for the vine is never omnipresent, and wheat never totally absent. This makes impossible any clear and obvious territorial division of the kingdom on the basis of agricultural activity. Moheau was thus the victim of his initial premise, and never succeeded in constructing a geographical division of the kingdom that would permit the classification of demographic data. This is an interesting example, therefore, of a good theoretical distinction that was of doubtful validity in terms of its grasp of the actual geographi-

cal reality.

Among other political arithmeticians, however, we do find workable systems of classification organizing statistical data and structuring thinking. It was Des Pommelles who divided France into five roughly parallel bands, based upon degree of latitude.⁵⁴ This reveals the obvious influence of the aerist theories which identified the type of air, its warmth and humidity, as the essential factor in the explanation of human behaviour. The neo-hippocratism of 18th-century medicine emphasized geographical location, and thus produced totally geometrical divisions of the country. Messance himself went back to three bands, slanting diagonally across the kingdom and dividing it into north, central, and southern regions. Despite appearances, aerism was not the only basis for this division. It was also justified by a complex combination of natural, demographic, and economic factors: "Justice demands that all taxation be proportionately adjusted between the provinces according to their respective resources in terms of population, output, industry, commerce, and location. And reason demands that provinces be compared with their neighbours, since they tend to have so much in common with one another; the analogy is enlightening and permits the comparison to be gradually extended, shedding light from one extremity to the other."⁵⁵ This says everything: both the ineradicably fiscal roots of political arithmetic, and the possibility of defining, in terms of the information gathered and of reasoning, geographical units suitable for analysis.

For all these demographers, all population data revealed a simple logic; i.e. the univocal and regular evolution from north to south. Thus it was in the case of density; as Messance asked: "Why is northern France more populous than the south, and why is the south even more sparsely populated than the centre?"⁵⁶ And Des Pommelles wrote: "It will be seen that the population per square league diminishes progressively by two for every two degrees from north to south."⁵⁷ For Des Pommelles, the search for the cause of this diminution provided an opportunity to refine the aerist theory. With regard to the north, he referred to "the nature of the land, which is less broken up by mountains and which, being more fertile, makes better provision for the subsistence of the inhabitants." Messance found a different reason: "It is because there is a greater number of towns in northern France than in the other parts, and until someone shows that northern France owes its larger population to some other cause, the large number of towns existing there, which provides a

large number of consumers, may be regarded as one of the principal causes, even if not the only one. This being the case, it would be the towns which populate the countryside, contrary to what has been said.”⁵⁸ Demographic variations thus lent fuel to one of the major debates of the century. Furthermore, the identification of a polarity between north and south as regards density provided an opportunity to refute the thesis of the depopulating and parasitic town.

If density decreased from north to south, fertility, on the other hand, increased, as was underlined by both Moheau and Des Pomelles. The latter found in this a corroboration, if there was any need for one, of the aerist theories: the proportion of births to marriages “increases progressively from north to south, except in those provinces where the large area of wood and pasture makes the air very humid (i.e La Rochelle, Poitiers, etc). It seems to me that one can thence conclude that when low morals, or any other ethical factors, do not stand in nature’s way, then marriages are more fertile in warm lands with dry air and high ground, than in those which are low, marshy, and where the air is heavy.”⁵⁹ Ten years earlier Moheau had adopted a similar explanatory scheme, but with some qualifications concerning dietary habits: “The type of diet has no less influence and effect; people who drink wine and consume astringent foodstuffs or spirituous liquor have a talent for multiplying.”⁶⁰ In the absence of some simple statistical index such as the ratio of births to marriages, mortality is more difficult to deal with: hence the shift towards statements about life expectancy. Here again, the quality of the air is the determining factor: “In the north, where the lack of warmth fosters a more sluggish development of the individual, the period of growth, maturation, and decline must be longer.”⁶¹ Nevertheless, this initial statement must be modified in the light of topographical details: “It appears that the areas in which man can look forward to the longest days are those among the hills and mountains. Those in which life is shortest are the marshy areas. The plains and valleys may prolong the days of their inhabitants according to their orientation.”⁶²

For the 18th century arithmeticians, the division of France into homogeneous geographical units became a source of problems. All, or most, of them worked within a system of thought which dominated their way of reasoning irrespective of its object. Aerist medical theory provided a prime cause since, as Moheau wrote: “The sovereign law of climate acts upon all that grows and breathes.” Above all, their France was a climatic one, and the

criteria of classification were based on latitude and altitude, which together determined the properties of the air. Such a principle held good at every level; it took regional contrasts into account, and at the same time permitted the division of the kingdom into several large units. But once this partition had been effected, dividing France into three or five, the original certainty faltered somewhat. It was not easy to dispose entirely of those elements which, even if they did to some extent depend upon climate, might act independently upon demographic behaviour: hence the role conceded to economic activities, cultural habits, and moral attitudes. The preeminence accorded to the qualities of the air dominated geographical understanding, which almost always worked in terms of a shift from north to south, rather than outright opposition. But other designs appeared on the canvas which no longer owed anything to the tyranny of climate. Thus we find in Messance the opposition between an urbanized France and one which was hardly so at all, and between a completely agricultural central France and a peripheral one to the north, west, and south, where "the main factories and commerce" were located.⁶³ These contradictory visions were expressions, in terms of geographical configurations, of a dilemma lying at the very heart of the epistemology of traditional demography.

The place of France on the map of Europe was signalled less by population statistics than by the data of physical anthropology, subsequently overlooked until d'Angeville. First Moheau, and then Expilly, dealt with the height of inhabitants, establishing that in France they were shorter than in other countries such as Germany and Switzerland. To understand this phenomenon involves going back into history: "It is my opinion that in France where the ancient inhabitants, as witnessed by the Romans themselves, were notable for their marked height and strength, the race may have degenerated because subsistence became more difficult for the mass of the people."⁶⁴ But the height of the French is better explained by that north/south law that governs all aspects of the population, than by some process of shrinkage, and it immediately puts the kingdom in a European perspective: "In France, as well as in the more southern countries such as Spain, Portugal, and the states of Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli etc, one does find men who are extremely sturdy, tall, and strong, but they are less numerous than in northern countries such as Switzerland and Germany."⁶⁵ The same principle, on the other hand, accounts for the contrasts observed within the kingdom: "France itself varies according to province; and it has been

generally observed that those in the north produce men of greater height than those in the south. An examination of police reports on deserters, including their description, show that those from Flanders or Picardy have a marked height advantage over those from Provence.”⁶⁶

This steady decline in men’s heights, from north to south, did not prevent the feeling that France, as a whole, belonged to southern Europe. Expilly, in passing, admitted as much when he wrote: “France cannot boast of the height of its inhabitants (. . .), which is the same as in the *other* southern countries”; and Moheau likewise, speaking of the greater fertility of the southern provinces, remarked that here the kingdom had the edge “vis-à-vis the North of Europe”. The theme of a France that was divided because it was torn between two Europes had not yet appeared, since this supposed the recognition of a linear rift across the nation. As far as 18th-century demographers were concerned, and perhaps others too, France was part of the southern community of nations: this feeling of membership remains to be analysed in terms of political allegiances, economic relations, and shared culture.

The physiocrats and political arithmeticians were thus able to conceive the geography of France as a unified entity; and this allowed them to identify units more or less reconcilable with their respective schemes: extending large-scale farming, or increasing the population. This kind of geographical interpretation hardly ever appeared outside their circle, and we must now try to understand this absence by looking at several other contemporary bodies of text.

If we turn to the geographers of the second half of the 18th century, one fact seems clear; and that was the preeminence given to the regional monograph, most commonly under the heading of ‘natural history’.⁶⁷ The list of titles reflects a bias towards the provinces of the south, no doubt on account of their fuller complement of academic institutions, and perhaps also because there was already an active pre-romantic disposition there towards mountainous landscapes. The internal structure of these ‘natural histories’ reveals the tension between the administrative aspect (since data were still often presented in the context of bailage, the seneschalsy, the civil diocese, or the *généralité*), and the geographical, in that the most innovative borrowed from Buache’s theory of river basins for the division used in their surveys. This type of regionalist approach spawned its own theoretical justifications. First there was stated the necessary priority of local study: “We can only hope to see a complete and general

Survey of France after a close survey of the provinces, executed on the spot by local scholars.”⁶⁸ Secondly, works of this genre served utility rather than simple curiosity: “Any natural history of a province that set its sights simply on documenting its fossils, describing its mountains, climate, and produce, would do no more than satisfy the curiosity. One which, on the other hand, related the various parts together, attempted to draw conclusions bearing upon mankind, and where possible related these to public utility, would be far more valuable.”⁶⁹ Covering areas of varying size, the regional survey was the most urgent and sensible undertaking because it made the relationship between phenomena apparent, and also had an ecological orientation. The geography of the *Philosophes* as far as it confined itself to the kingdom, made this into a major genre (soon to be based upon new work in provincial cartography), pushing into second place those general surveys of the kingdom that perpetuated the rather fading traditions of Piganiol de la Force. But the corollary of this preference was the obvious impossibility of conceiving, readily at least, the totality of the kingdom, and consequently of conceiving its division into a small number of parts.

A similar assertion of regionalism is to be found in the collective studies undertaken by the provincial academies.⁷⁰ One out of every two of these undertook a local history of either its city or province; and some, such as Bordeaux, Clermont, and Auxerre, drew up schemes for documenting their region’s riches and resources. The horizons of one’s own local region appealed for obvious emotional reasons, but also because they provided a frame of reference for a possible observation. Even before the provincial academicians, the Benedictines had conceived a similar idea, and had outlined a plan for a series of regional histories, covering the whole kingdom. These finally survived in manuscript form, save for the one on the Languedoc.⁷¹ In these ‘natural and literary histories’, the region once again showed itself to be the most manageable area; it was convenient for exhaustive study, and for the useful and rational classification of data collected. Thus, in their own manner, the provincial academies expressed that discovery of the provinces which marks the second half of the 18th century, another expression of which is to be found in the various literary forms (plays, novels, and essays) which contrasted the world of the capital and the universe of the provinces.⁷² Though overlooked by the cartographical statisticians of the *monarchie censitaire*, this tension sometimes reappeared, as in Guerry’s geography of suicide: “Generally speaking, from no matter

which point in France one begins, the number of suicides grows steadily as one advances towards the capital.”⁷³ In this reminder of the baneful influence of the bloated city can be heard the echo of an old idea: that Paris and the provinces also constitute two Frances, whose contrasts might well be examined. There is no doubt that this is the opposition most familiar to men of the 18th century.⁷⁴

Since the provinces did not constitute a single entity, they had to be dealt with in either historically or naturally determined areas, if they were to be understood. The medical topographies were a good illustration of this approach. These, as is well known, emerged in three stages: first in 1768 through the initiatives of Lepecq de la Cloture, who organized a network of correspondents based on Rouen; then in August 1776, with the decree of the *Conseil* creating the *Société royale de médecine* and instituting a national enquiry into epidemics and epizootic diseases; and finally with the October 1778 session of the *Société royale*, which drew up a plan for a physico-medical survey of the kingdom, based on the multiplication of regional monographs.⁷⁵ This gave birth to a whole movement, inspired by the local or provincial, and which reached its zenith in the 19th century. The immense mass of material still remains to be studied, but some idea of the scope of such surveys can be gleaned from the example of Normandy: this comprises towns, with or without surrounding countryside, district, and *département*.⁷⁶ In 1778 the *Société royale de médecine* had pronounced in favour of the “canton” or province. Throughout the medical topographies one may discern a regional consciousness which voluntarily confined itself within restricted areas, and which was unquestionably the principal obstacle in the 18th century to a macroscopic conception of the kingdom. The persistence into the following century of a picture of France that was neither bipartite nor tripartite, but shattered into myriad units, each with its own abiding uniqueness, shows that even if the theme of the two Frances did dominate the major debates, it did not suppress men’s continued attachment to their own native regions.

This survey — incomplete though it is in its coverage of the documentary evidence and confined to one century — raises an essential question which is that of the relationship between statistical and geographical conceptions and the exercise of power. Politicians had, in fact, long appeared reconciled to the disparities that extended

throughout the kingdom: that 'aggregation of disunited peoples' was something both accepted and, except by those obsessed by systems, appreciated. In their contrast to the capital, the provinces formed a whole, but a motley one, and towards the close of the 18th century men applied themselves enthusiastically and with dedication to the painstaking study of the history of those provinces and the promise they held for the future. Moreover, in the final days of the Absolutism that had always had to compromise with this teeming diversity, it was in regional and provincial consciousness that schemes for reform were nurtured, and in which rebellions took root. Revolutionary and imperial Jacobinism were to endeavour to modify this co-existence between centralizing power and a fragmented country. To what extent they were successful is not important here, but it is clear that after this juncture we find a new relationship between political power and the area over which it was exercised. The homogeneity of the country became both desire and designs, the *sine qua non* and hallmark of good policy. It was not surprising, therefore, to see people of distinction becoming arithmeticians under the *monarchie censitaire*; to them, the continuing acceptance of these economic, cultural or moral disparities seemed both deficient and dangerous, a condition to be overcome by reducing to simple laws those variations which might be thought, which indeed had been thought, to be contingent. Ideally, proposals for a society should start upon even foundations, or at least with the identification of any unevenness. Born of the nostalgic longing for unity, the theme of the two Frances becomes the vehicle of opposed futures, and its very incertitudes were the expression of a new conception of the relationship between power and society.

For this reason, choosing it as our subject of study might also prompt one or two remarks on the relationships between modern historical discourse and these voices from the past. The continuing construction of quantifiable indicators on the basis of which historians then drew their own particular France on the map of the Kingdom, the Empire, or the Republic, has had the result of making previous ideas seem obsolete. Nowadays it is simply a matter of validating or invalidating the intuitions of one's most lucid precursors among past sources. But in doing this we are, perhaps, forgetting two things. First, that it is not so easy to disentangle traditional issues from current problematics, and that we therefore need, parallel to one another, a methodical analysis of past conceptions and a critical appraisal of contemporary historical praxis. Secondly,

the debates of the past are not simply dim signposts to the present, but must be interpreted as to their specific structure, content, and function. On the basis of this we shall be able to lay bare the successive contradictory ideological commitments that accompanied so apparently neutral a theme as that of the two Frances. It would also enable us to ask both constructive and useful questions about the validity, origins, and position of our own historical production.

Roger Chartier (born 1945) is Assistant Professor at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), Paris, and Associate Director of the Centre de Recherches Historiques (EHESS). His major field of interest is the cultural history of 16th-19th century France. Recent publications: *L'éducation en France du 16e au 18e siècle*, 1976 (in collaboration with M.M. Compère and D. Julia); "Les arts de mourir, 1450-1600", *Annales*, 1976; "L'histoire quantitative du livre", *Revue Française d'Histoire du Livre* 16, 1977 (with D. Roche). *Author's address*: Centre de Recherches Historiques, 54, bd Raspail, 75270 Paris Cedex 06.

Notes

1. For the combined interpretation of economic, demographic, and anthropological indicators, cf. E. Le Roy Ladurie, "Un théoricien de développement: Adolphe d'Angeville", an introduction to the new edition of A. d'Angeville, *Essai sur la statistique de la population française considérée sous quelques-uns de ses rapports physiques et moraux*, The Hague, Mouton, 1969; reprinted in *Le territoire de l'historien*, Paris, Gallimard, 1973, pp. 349-392.

2. M. Demonet, P. Dumont, E. Le Roy Ladurie, "Anthropologie de la jeunesse masculine en France au niveau d'une cartographie cantonale (1819-1830)", *Annales ESC*, 1976, pp. 700-755.

3. A. Balbi, *Essai statistique sur le royaume de Portugal et d'Algarve comparé aux autres Etats de l'Europe*, Paris, 1822, vol. 2, pp. 134-149; the table showing the number of pupils for each of the twenty-six educational districts is to be found p. 146.

4. D. Julia and P. Pressly, "La population scolaire en 1789. Les extravagances statistiques du Ministre Villemain", *Annales ESC*, 1975, pp. 1516-1561.

5. A.M. Guerry, "Statistique comparée de l'état de l'instruction et du nombre de crimes", *Revue Encyclopédique*, août 1832.

6. C. Malte-Brun, review of Balbi's book in the *Journal des Débats*, issued on June 17th, July 4th and 21st, 1823. The statements quoted are to be found in the third part of the review.

7. C. Dupin, *Effets de l'enseignement populaire de la lecture, de l'écriture et de l'arithmétique, de la géométrie et la mécanique appliquées aux arts, sur les pros-*

pérités de la France, address to the opening session of the *cours normal de géométrie et de la mécanique appliquées aux arts*, November 30th 1826, at the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers, Paris, 1826, p. 27. The map presented on the occasion of this conference was to be included in the *Forces productives et commerciales de la France*, Paris, 1827, plate 1. (It has been republished by M-M Compère in: R. Chartier, M-M. Compère, D. Julia, *L'éducation en France du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, SEDES, 1975, p. 17.)

8. C. Dupin, *Effets*, op. cit., p. 28.

9. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

10. E.W. Fox, *L'autre France*, Paris, Flammarion, 1973.

11. Stendhal, *Vie de Henri Brulard*, first published unabridged by Henry Debraye, Paris, Champion, 1913, vol. 1, pp. 240-241. This text is quoted, with comments, by F. Furet and J. Ozouf, "Trois siècles de métissage culturel", *Annales ESC*, 1977, pp. 500-501.

12. C. Dupin, *Forces*, op. cit., vol. 2., pp. 249-280.

13. See J.-C. Perrot's basic article "L'âge d'or de la statistique régionale (an IV-1804)", *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, April-June 1976, pp. 215-276.

14. J. Peuchet, *Statistique élémentaire de la France*, Paris, 1805, and with P. Chanlaire, *Description topographique et statistique de la France*, Paris, 1810.

15. Chaptal, *De l'industrie française*, Paris, 1819. The following are two examples of the descriptive method employed: p. 153, "Everything has been given over to cultivation, and the harvests have multiplied tenfold. Examples of this kind are to be found in every part of France"; p. 154, "Nowhere are the animals sufficiently numerous, save in two or three provinces" (our emphasis).

16. On the tension between the particular and the uniform, at the very heart of the departmental prefectural statistics, cf. M.-N. Bourguet, "Race et folklore. L'image officielle de la France en 1810", *Annales ESC*, 1976, pp. 802-823.

17. C. Dupin, *Forces*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 252.

18. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 263.

19. Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 273-274.

20. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 1.

21. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 267.

22. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 1.

23. On this essential document, see M. Perrot, "Délinquance et système pénitentiaire en France au XIXe siècle", *Annales ESC*, 1975, pp. 67-91.

24. The complete title of this sheet (in the typographical sense of the word), which was sold at six francs (eight francs mounted on canvas) reveals as much about the various statistical parts as it does about their public: *The French Monarchy compared to the principal States of the World, or an Essay on the statistics of France considered in their geographical, moral and political implications, showing in a single table the maximum, minimum, and average figures for its population, wealth, industry, commerce, education and the morality of its inhabitants, compared to their correlatives in several countries of the Old and New Worlds; for the use of statesmen, administrators, bankers, merchants, travellers, and especially of Messieurs the Peers of France and of Messieurs the Deputies.*

25. A.M. Guerry, *Essai sur la statistique morale de la France*, Paris, 1833; an extract from this work had been published in August 1832, in the *Revue Encyclopédique*.

26. A.M. Guerry, op. cit., p. 9.

27. C. Dupin, *Forces*, op. cit., vol. 1 p. 1.

28. A.M. Guerry, op. cit., p. 42.

29. Ibid., p. 47.
30. Benoiston de Chateaufort, *De la colonisation des condamnés*, Paris, 1827, pp. 3-4.
31. P. Bigot de Morogues, *De la misère des ouvriers et de la marche à suivre pour y remédier*, Paris, 1832.
32. Villeneuve-Bargemon, *Economie politique chrétienne, ou recherches sur la nature et les causes du paupérisme en France et en Europe*, Paris, 1834.
33. P. Bigot de Morogues, op. cit., p. 120.
34. Villeneuve-Bargemon, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 46.
35. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 10.
36. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 23.
37. A. d'Angeville, *Essai sur la statistique de la population française sous quelques-uns de ses rapports physiques et moraux*, Bourg-en-Bresse, 1836.
38. Ibid., pp. 15-16.
39. Ibid., pp. 125-126.
40. Ibid., p. 124.
41. F. Quesnay, article on *Fermiers* (*Econ. Polit.*), January 1756, *François Quesnay et la physiocratie*, Paris, INED, 1958, vol. 2, p. 428.
42. F. Quesnay, article on *Grains*, November 1757, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 461.
43. De Butré, "Apologie de la science économique sur la distinction entre la grande et la petite culture contre les critiques de M. de F.," *Ephémérides du citoyen*, 1769, vols. 9, 10 and 11; here see vol. 10, pp. 8-9. Our thanks are due to J.-C. Perrot for bringing this text to our notice.
44. F. Quesnay, *Grains*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 461.
45. De Butré, op. cit., vol. 11, pp. 87-88.
46. Le Trosne, *La liberté du commerce des grains toujours utile et jamais nuisible*, 1765, pp. 28-29.
47. De Butré, op. cit., vol. 9, p. 21.
48. Ibid., vol. 10, pp. 133-134.
49. Ibid., vol. 10, p. 78, p. 88 and p. 119.
50. J.-C. Perrot, *Genèse d'une ville moderne. Caen au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris/The Hague, Mouton, 1975, vol. 1, pp. 237-240.
51. De Butré, op. cit., vol. 10, pp. 80-81.
52. Chaptal, op. cit., p. 140.
53. Moheau, *Recherches et considérations sur la population de la France*, Paris, 1778, pp. 67-69.
54. Des Pommelles, *Tableau de la population de toutes les provinces de la France*, Paris, 1789, p. 55.
55. Messance, *Nouvelles recherches sur la population de la France*, Lyon, 1788, p. 43.
56. Ibid., p. 48.
57. Des Pommelles, op. cit., p. 56.
58. Messance, op. cit., p. 87.
59. Des Pommelles, op. cit., p. 63.
60. Moheau, op. cit., p. 139.
61. Ibid., p. 191.
62. Ibid., p. 202.
63. Messance, op. cit., p. 87.
64. J.-J. Expilly, *Tableau de la population de la France*, Paris, 1780, p. 28.

65. Idem.
66. Moheau, op. cit., p. 118.
67. This is based upon N. Broc, *La géographie des philosophes. Géographes et voyageurs français au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, Editions Ophrys, 1975, pp. 406-419.
68. E. Beguillet and C. Courtepee, *Description générale et particulière du Duché de Bourgogne*, Dijon, 1774-1785, introduction quoted by N. Broc, op. cit., p. 415.
69. M. Darluc, *Histoire naturelle de la Provence*, Avignon, 1782-1786, p. VII, quoted by N. Broc, op. cit., p. 407.
70. D. Roche, *Le siècle des Lumières en province. Académies et académiciens provinciaux (1680-1789)*, Paris/The Hague, Mouton, 1978, chapter 6.
71. Our thanks are due to M.J. Glénisson for having drawn our attention to this regional history project.
72. J.-C. Perrot, *Genèse d'une ville moderne*, op. cit., vol. 2, appendix 28, p. 1028, affords an introductory account of the literature devoted to the Paris/province duality, which numbered twenty-one titles between 1737-1793.
73. A.M. Guerry, op. cit., p. 65.
74. We cite one text (from among many) taken from D. Roche: a letter from Chalamond de la Visclède, permanent secretary of the *Académie de Marseille*, to the *Académie française*, January 12th, 1726: "You, Messieurs, have already ensured good taste at the heart of the kingdom; now, it only remains to carry it to the frontiers."
75. J.-P. Peter, "Une enquête de la Société Royale de Médecine (1774-1794): maladies et maladies à la fin du XVIII^e siècle", *Annales ESC*, 1967, pp. 711-751; and J.-C. Perrot, "L'âge d'or de la statistique régionale", art. cit. p. 222.
76. J.-C. Perrot, *Genèse d'une ville moderne*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 892, note 168.